



ENVIRONMENT . PARKS . OPEN SPACE

issue committee **REPORT**

INDIANAPOLIS-MARION COUNTY
Comprehensive Plan Update



ENVIRONMENT . PARKS . OPEN SPACE

issue committee **REPORT**

CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS

Bart Peterson, Mayor

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Harold Anderson

James J. Curtis

Gene Hendricks

Lee Marble

Brian P. Murphy

Robert J. Smith

Randolph L. Snyder

Ed Treacy

Sylvia Trotter

DEPARTMENT OF METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

Carolyn M. Coleman, Director

DIVISION OF PLANNING

Maury Plambeck, Administrator

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

Keith Holdsworth, Principal Planner

Alice Gatewood, Planner

Kevin Gross, Senior Planner

AUGUST 2001

Credits

This process could not have been undertaken without the efforts of the committee members who volunteered so much of their time:

Jeffrey Miller, Chair, *Earth Day Indiana*

Sandra Miles, *Sierra Club, Heartlands Group*

R. M. Van Frank, *Amos W. Butler Chapter, National Audubon Society*

Merri Anderson, *Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations*

Linda Broadfoot, *Keep Indianapolis Beautiful*

Jayne Langan, *Sierra Club, Heartlands Group*

Don Miller, *Indy Parks Land Stewardship*

Donna Price, *Department of Public Works*

Donald Colvin, *Indy Parks Resource Department*

Greg Lindsey, *IUPUI School of Public and Environmental Affairs*

Jeff Gearhart, *West Indianapolis Development Corporation*

Robert Snyder, *American Institute of Architects*

Lou Ann Baker, *United Water*

Mark Boyce, *C.P. Morgan*

Todd Cook, *Indianapolis Regional Economic Development Partnership*

Alicia Craig, *National Audubon Society, Amos W. Butler Chapter*

David Forsell

Kyle Hendrix, *Department of Metropolitan Development Brownfields Coordinator*

Jeffrey Marble, *Mapleton-Fall Creek Development Corporation*

Russell McClure

Sheila McKinley, *Ratio Architects*

Scott Miller, *Mainscape, Inc.*

Neil Myers, *J. F. New & Associates*

Cindy Spoljaric, *Marion County Wellfield Education Corporation*

Maria Steiner, *Keep Indianapolis Beautiful*

William Beranek, Jr., *Indiana Environmental Institute, Inc.*

Jennifer Bowman, *Baker & Daniels*

Diane Foglesong

Vince Griffin, *Indiana State Chamber of Commerce*

Jay Ham, *Baker & Daniels*

Ray Irvin, *Indy Parks Greenways*

Kevin Kirk, *Department of Public Works*

John Kupke, *Consulting Engineers of Indiana*

Rick Martin, *Department of Public Works, Environmental Resources Management*

Marcia Matthieu, *Marion County Soil & Water Conservation District*

Carl Pebworth, *Baker & Daniels*

Roger Stephens, *Builders Association of Greater Indianapolis*

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the following agencies for providing meeting facilities to the Environment, Parks and Open Space Committee:

Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center

Department of Parks and Recreation – Burello Center (Garfield Park)

Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library – various locations

Dear Members of the Indianapolis Insight Steering Committee:

I am pleased to submit the final recommendations of the Environment, Parks and Open Space Issue Committee for your consideration. The committee members brought a wide variety of backgrounds, interest and concerns to every discussion. The complexity and breath of issues we addressed necessitated an additional meeting and two smaller group meetings on tree and water quality issues. Overall attendance over the past six months has been exceptional and, to that end, I appreciate the unselfish time and effort donated to the committee by its members.

The purpose of this committee was to study the relationship between the environment and the current and future development of this city. It was the challenge of this committee to think about how a lively community of over a million people can grow in ways that are healthful both to the human population and to the environment.

Many of the meetings' presenters were private and not-for-profit sector experts proving outside testimony and explaining best management practices being implemented in other communities. The structure and context of the meetings would not have been as productive as they were without the excellent staff support we received. The committee owes a debt of thanks to DMD Principal Planner Keith Holdsworth whose insight, experience, professionalism and dedication facilitated the needs of the committee and kept us on track.

I am pleased to report that our recommendations reflect a consensus of opinions. While the committee has a concern about the accelerated pace of the Indianapolis Insight Report, compared to previous master plan initiatives, we believe that the continued solicitation of grassroots ideas and subsequent public meetings will ensure an end product to which all Indianapolis residents can be proud.

This committee considered a number of issues and made recommendations and developed standards regarding them. Among the issues on which the committee deliberated are those involving clean water (groundwater protection, surface water quality, development of floodplains), clean air, trees and woodlands (preservation of existing trees and planting of new ones), brownfields, parks and greenways, open space and environmental considerations in City planning processes. Some of the notable accomplishments of this committee are:

Bringing consideration of wellfield issues into the Comprehensive Plan.

Wellfield protection is an area that has been given greater scientific and governmental attention in Marion County since the adoption of the 1990-1993 Comprehensive Plan. New knowledge and new processes in wellfield protection have been incorporated into this committee's recommendations.

Recommending buffer zones along creeks and rivers. The committee has recommended amending the zoning ordinances to require preservation of existing dense vegetative cover or the planting of dense vegetative cover along stream banks. Among the reasons for this recommendation are erosion control, contaminant capture, habitat preservation, and water cooling (water cooling is important for retaining oxygen levels, an important component of water quality).

Bringing consideration of pedestrian-oriented and transit-oriented development into the Comprehensive Plan to help improve air quality. Drops in ozone-producing emissions from automobiles have been offset by the increasing number of miles being driven. The committee has made recommendations that should result in development that encourages people to use modes of transportation other than the automobile.

Recommending increased tree planting. In addition to recommendations concerning the preservation of existing trees and woodlands, the committee recommends that the Subdivision Control Ordinance be amended to require street trees in new plats and that the Commercial Zoning Ordinance be amended to require greater landscaping within large parking lots.

Setting standards for park designations in the Comprehensive Plan. The committee set a standard of 17.3 acres of parkland to be set aside for every 1000 persons of actual or projected population and has further set a standard of a park within 1 mile of each residential development.

Dividing the Urban Conservation land use category into two categories. Under the 1990-1993 Comprehensive Plan the Urban Conservation category served two functions which often proved confusing. This committee recommends dividing those functions into two new land use categories: "Floodway" and "Environmentally Sensitive".

The environment plays an important and integral part in the quality of life for all of the inhabitants of Indianapolis and should not be taken for granted. The acquisition of new park land, the preservation of open space and the conservation of our environment will be the best legacy we can pass on to the future generations. To paraphrase one of our committee volunteers; the greatest compliment and

demonstration of appreciation that the Indianapolis Insight Steering Committee could extend to the citizens of Indianapolis for the work done by the Environment, Parks and Open Space Issue Committee would be to implement as many of its recommendations as possible.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Miller

Contents

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
Introduction	3
Committee Description	4
II. SOLUTION FINDING	7
Issues, Recommendations, and Standards	
Issue – Clean Water	9
Issue – Clean Air	14
Issue – Trees and Woodlands	17
Issue – Brownfields	19
Issue – Consideration of Environmental Issues in City Planning	20
Issue – Light/Noise/Views	21
Issue – Parks and Greenways	22
Issue – Open Space/Access to Nature	24
III. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION	27
Appendices	
Appendix 1 – Comprehensive Planning	29
Appendix 2 – Values Statements	32
Appendix 3 – Resources	34
Appendix 4 – Meeting Minutes	35
Appendix 5 - Glossary of Planning Terms and Acronyms	50

Background
INFORMATION

Introduction

Updating the Indianapolis/Marion County Comprehensive Plan is a complex and challenging undertaking, offering an opportunity for the City and its citizens to develop a realistic vision for the future.

The Environment, Parks and Open Space Committee is one of eight Issue Committees formed to provide a forum for detailed public discussion of various topics. Each committee was made up of 30 to 40 experts, city staff persons and just plain folks to discuss their issues and develop goals, recommendations and standards in their particular topical area. The committee meetings were open to anyone who wanted to attend.

The public input process of the Comprehensive Plan Update began with four Town Hall Meetings. These meetings were held in various locations around the city and on various weeknights in late September and early October 2000. Through the course of the Town Hall meetings, several recurring themes also became evident. These themes required in-depth study. However, the format of the Town Hall meetings did not permit this so eight issue committees were formed to provide the required additional analysis.

The eight committees formed were:

- Cultural, Social and Education
- Economic Development
- Environment, Parks and Open Space
- Land Use Standards and Procedures
- Neighborhoods and Housing
- Redevelopment
- Regionalism
- Transportation and Infrastructure

Each of the eight Issue Committees met eight to nine times from late January to early July 2001. The invitation to join an issue committee was made at the Town Hall meetings and through a newsletter sent to over 1200 persons and organizations including every registered neighborhood association in the city. Over 300 persons volunteered to serve on a committee. Committee members were polled as to their most convenient meeting times and the meetings were scheduled accordingly.

Following is a description of this committee's task and then the issues, goals, recommendations and standards that it developed.

Committee Description

Development of cities is one of the most obvious current-day shapers of the environment. The impact is obvious in its physical impact on the land, but also because we see it happening before our eyes in the places we live.

The impact of people living in community has presented challenges since the beginning of permanent settlements. Certainly Indianapolis has had to live with the choices of its forebears, such as the filling of swamps along White River and Fall Creek to create buildable land and the construction of our combined sewer system to provide a more sanitary way to dispose of our waste.

The purpose of this committee was to study the relationship between the environment and the current and future development of this city. It was the challenge of this committee to think about how a lively community of over a million people can grow in ways that are healthful both to the human population and to the environment. The committee has set goals, made recommendations, and set standards concerning the environment, parks and open space.

The issues that this committee was formed to study were raised in the course of four Town Hall meetings held across the city in September and October of 2000. These issues include:

Clean Water

- Preservation of waterways and wetlands
- Improvement of water quality
- Utilization of surface water for recreation/drinking water
- Drainage
- Construction in floodplains
- Safe groundwater supply of drinking water
- Improvement of the sewer system
- Drainage

Clean air

Trees and woodlands

- Preservation/conservation of existing trees and woodlands
- Tree planting

Redevelopment of brownfields

Consideration of environmental issues in city planning

Clean city (litter, graffiti, clean streets)*

Parks and greenways

- Preservation of existing parks and greenways
- Addition of new parks and greenways to adequately and conveniently serve the population

Open space

- Preservation of open space
- Accessibility of open space

Other

- Access to nature
- Light pollution

* The committee decided that Clean City issues were outside the scope of the Comprehensive Plan and thus did not develop goals, recommendations or standards for these issues.

solution
FINDING

Issues, Recommendations and Standards

issue

CLEAN WATER

Description

Many issues found themselves under the umbrella of clean water including groundwater protection, surface water quality, drainage and flooding. Since the time of the 1990-1993 Comprehensive Plan, State statutes have mandated that processes be put in place to better protect the groundwater in public wellfields. Marion County's wellfield protection processes continue to evolve and should be reflected in subsequent planning.

Like many cities, surface water quality is an ongoing issue for Indianapolis. Development practices can either compound water quality problems or do their part to solve problems. For example, poor development techniques can cause soil erosion, filling streams with silt, and tree removal along steambanks allows streamwater to heat in the sun. Both excessive sediment and excessive heat degrade water quality.

Amount of surface water is also a concern. The county's soil types and relatively level topography make positive drainage a major problem. On the other hand, as more of Marion County is covered with hard surfaces, water is often entering our streams too quickly; increasing flooding.

goal one Protect the County's underground supply of drinking water.		
<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Responsible parties</i>	<i>Comments</i>
a) Amend the Wellfield Protection zoning ordinance to ban the construction of new septic systems in wellfields.	DMD, MCWEC, MCHD	
b) Amend the Wellfield Protection zoning ordinance to ban potentially polluting businesses in 1-yr. time of travel zone.	DMD, MCWEC	
c) Fund MCWEC for the purpose of promoting	DMD	

wellfield protection among existing businesses.		
d) Amend the Gravel, Sand and Borrow (GSB) District zoning ordinance to protect the underground water supplies from contamination by regulating the commercial removal of topsoil, subsoil, and aggregate deposits which are the filtering mechanism over the wellfield aquifers.	DMD, MCWEC, Hazardous Materials Technical Committee	
e) Create and fund a program for conservation easements, restrictive covenants or land acquisitions and transfers for wellfield protection.	DMD, Water Utilities, DPR	Tax delinquent properties may be a good place to start.
f) Emphasize brownfield clean-up and redevelopment in wellfields within the City's overall brownfield program.	DMD	New land uses should not be those with a risk of groundwater contamination.
g) Within the City's overall redevelopment program, provide special marketing of properties in wellfields for redevelopment with non- or less-polluting industry.	DMD	Tax delinquent properties may be a good place to start.
h) Continue the review of new business development in wellfield protection areas for wellfield protection measures as required by the Wellfield Protection zoning ordinance.	DMD, DPW	This is done through the review of the TQP (Technically Qualified Person).
i) Amend the Wellfield Protection zoning ordinance to require review of business use changes and expansions in wellfield protection areas for wellfield protection measures.	DMD, DPW, MCWEC	This is especially important in lease space and flexspace situations where a business that does not use contaminants might be succeeded by one that does.
j) Amend the Wellfield Protection zoning ordinance to require notification of the neighborhood where a TQP review is taking place.	DMD, DPW, MCWEC, MCHD	
k) Implement a systematic method of compliance inspection for wellfield	DMD, DPW, MCHD	

protection measures.		
l) Better integrate administration (permitting and inspections) of the Flood Control District Zoning Ordinance with the TQP process.	DMD, DPW	
m) Amend the Dwelling District zoning ordinance to require connection to a wastewater system within the DP zoning district.	DMD	
n) Amend state law to allow municipalities to ban new non-residential construction utilizing septic systems.	DMD, MCHD	Although DMD can suggest such legislation, it is in the control of the State legislature to propose, hear and enact legislation.
Standards: When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:	Justification	
i. identify critical water resource areas.	Protection of drinking water supply	
ii. recommend land uses in wellfields that are less polluting uses such as parks, open space, residential, and office.	Protection of drinking water supply	

goal two

Protect and improve the County's surface waters (rivers, lakes, ponds and tributaries); develop the city in ways that do not exacerbate flooding, and provide for the appropriate and safe use of flood-prone areas.

Recommendations	Responsible parties	Comments
a) Amend the Zoning Ordinances to require preservation of existing dense vegetative cover or the planting of dense vegetative cover along stream and tributary banks for the purposes of erosion control, contaminant capture, water cooling (important for retaining oxygen levels) and habitat	DMD, DPW	Vegetation should be of sufficient height to provide adequate shading. Use of native plant communities should be emphasized

preservation.		
b) Support the proposed amendments to Stormwater Design and Construction Specifications Manual to require control of stormwater runoff quality based on management of total suspended solids through the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) .	DPW	
c) Amend the Zoning Ordinances to institute parking maximums.	DMD	
d) Develop a site plan review procedure in the rezoning process aimed at reducing impervious surfaces through use of alternative street layouts, efficient parking layouts and use of pervious materials in "spillover" parking areas.	DMD	
e) Continue current City policies to manage stormwater so that development will not adversely affect the water quality of downstream properties.	DMD, DPW	
f) Maintain and improve current City practice of coordinating water-related projects and programs through multi-agency watershed teams.	DMD, DPW, DPR	
g) Amend the Dwelling District Zoning Ordinance to allow shared driveways that connect two or more homes together.	DMD, DPW	Reduces overall lot imperviousness.
h) Develop standards for the ongoing maintenance of the stormwater devices (retention ponds, inlet and out fall structures, buffer areas, etc.)	DMD, DPW	Standards could be used for maintenance plans that could, in turn, be required as part of zoning commitments.
i) Better integrate administration (permitting and inspections) of the Flood Control District Zoning Ordinance into the zoning	DMD, DPW	

and variance process.		
j) Determine the appropriate agency to work on issues concerning the replacement of topsoil in new developments instead of current, common practice of scraping and selling topsoil during development of a parcel.	DMD, DPW	This is important for stormwater percolation, which contributes to aquifer recharge, reduced run-off and more easily maintained turf (less watering, less chemicals).
k) Create and fund a program that gathers private capital funds to implement BMP's, acquires water quality related sensitive sites and mitigation areas.	DMD, MCWEC, DPR	
Standards: When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:	Justification	
iii. use "Floodway" as the land use category for floodways.	To emphasize the ban on building in floodways.	
iv. identify natural features that provide for clean water benefits, i.e. wetlands (natural and constructed), forested tracts, ravines, and feeder streams or headwater areas	To raise level of awareness of these attributes	
v. propose land uses that are likely to have the least impact on increasing flooding and are likely to be the least impacted by flooding within the floodplains.	To decrease the risk of flooding within each watershed and to minimize damages when flooding occurs.	

issue
CLEAN AIR

Description

The Indianapolis region may be subject to major federal penalties, not to mention exacerbation of respiratory ailments among our residents, if the region fails to meet clean air standards. Much of the air quality problem now stems from consumer sources such as vehicles and small engines on household devices such as lawn mowers. Drops in ozone-producing emissions from automobiles have been offset by the increasing number of miles being driven. Many factors contribute to the continuing increases in vehicle miles. In many parts of Marion County the physical forms of development discourage or exclude alternatives to the private automobile such as walking, biking and mass transit.

goal three To develop the City in a manner that does not unduly contribute to diminished air quality and, where possible, retrofit the forms of the City to improve air quality.		
<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Responsible parties</i>	<i>Comments</i>
a) Amend the Commercial and Industrial zoning ordinances to require sidewalks in new development.	DMD	To encourage less vehicular use.
b) Require walking/bicycling accessibility among neighborhoods and other neighborhoods, commercial areas, recreation and institutional facilities and public transportation.	DMD	To encourage less vehicular use.
c) Amend the appropriate ordinances to require connection of new subdivision streets to existing "stub streets" in surrounding residential developments.	DMD, DPW	To provide simple connections among subdivisions without being forced to use the arterial street system.
d) Implement traffic calming standards for new neighborhoods and, where feasible, for existing neighborhoods.	DMD, DPW	

e) Preserve road and rail rights-of-way for future regional mass transit use.	DMD, DPW	
f) Provide incentives for “High Occupancy Vehicles” such as park and ride areas.	DMD, DPW	
g) Provide for connectivity between various modes of public transportation.	DMD, DPW	
h) Prioritize city infrastructure improvements to make redevelopment sites and their environs more attractive and competitive	DMD, DPW	Some older areas need significant improvements to streets, sidewalks, storm sewers
i) Encourage shared parking & parking ratios that allow for street parking and pedestrian traffic in redevelopment/infill areas	DMD	
j) Provide flexible zoning districts and procedures to attract new uses for obsolete structures and sites.	DMD	
k) Provide sidewalks on arterial streets that currently do not have sidewalks when those streets undergo significant reconstruction (widening, full depth resurfacing)	DPW, MPO	
<i>Standards:</i> <i>When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:</i>	<i>Justification</i>	
vi. recommend residential densities greater than 3.5 units per acre for areas near concentrations of employment or near major commercial centers.	Provides a stepped transition from high intensity land uses to lower intensity land uses and provides more persons with walking/bicycling options.	
vii. recommend residential densities in the 5 to 8 units per acre category or greater for areas on bus routes.	Provides great enough densities for a functional bus system.	
viii. recommend residential densities in the 8 to 15 units per acre category or greater for areas near proposed light rail stations.	Provides great enough densities for a functional light rail system.	

ix. coordinate with the thoroughfare plan.	Combines the objectives of minimizing deviations from the land use plan and maintaining an acceptable “level-of-service” on thoroughfares.
x. use the Urban Mixed-Use and the Village Mixed-Use land use categories to provide a mix of land uses	Mixed-use developments encourage walking and biking as alternatives to driving. Location on a mass transit route is a very beneficial, although not mandatory, element of mixed-use developments.

issue

TREES AND WOODLANDS

Description

The native vegetation of Marion County was mainly a deciduous hardwood forest. Within forty years of settlement most of the Marion County woodland was cleared to make way for the building of the new town, construction of roads and agriculture. Today about 1.3% of Marion County (approximately 3368 acres) remains as natural woods. Of this, about 1,212 acres are in City or State parks.

goal four

Take full advantage of the positive impacts of trees on the urban environment by conserving existing trees and planting new trees.

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Responsible parties</i>	<i>Comments</i>
a) Develop programs to identify and work to conserve street trees and notable specimen trees.	City Forester, DPR, DMD	
b) Better coordinate administration (permitting and inspections) of the Flood Control District Zoning Ordinance with plan review for tree preservation.	DMD, DPW, DPR, City Forester	
c) Promote the use of the Supplemental Review to broaden the discussion of environmental factors.	DMD	
d) Develop a county-wide tree conservation ordinance for both public and private land that limits site clearing, and uses a tiered approach based on forest types.	DMD, DPR, City Forester	<p>The full range of the environmental qualities of woodlands should be considered, not just appearance.</p> <p>The City of Ann Arbor, MI's "Guidelines for the Protection and Mitigation of Natural Features" is a good example of the system proposed.</p>

e) Review City rules and policies to determine which are not “tree-friendly”. Work to make these rules and policies more “tree-friendly.”	DMD	
f) Amend the Commercial District Zoning ordinance to require a greater level of landscaping within parking lots.	DMD	A standard based on canopy may be the most effective method.
g) Encourage use of the Cluster Option available in the Dwelling District Zoning Ordinance as a valuable tool for preservation of woodlands.	DMD	
h) Amend the Subdivision Control Ordinance to require provision of street trees in new subdivisions.	DMD, DPR, City Forester	<p>In addition to the current lists of recommended trees and shrubs, the City should provide to developers and to the general public a list of invasive exotic trees and shrubs that should not be used in landscaping.</p> <p>Develop and provide to Homeowner Associations standards for the ongoing maintenance of the trees.</p>
<i>Standards:</i> <i>When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:</i>	<i>Justification</i>	
xi. native forest fragments, riparian corridors, stands of native trees, wooded wetlands and important urban and pioneer woodlands should be depicted as Environmentally Sensitive Areas. The City of Ann Arbor, MI’s “Guidelines for the Protection and Mitigation of Natural Features” is a good example of the system proposed.	<p>Preservation of trees is in the public interest because of their function in reducing air pollution through absorption of carbon dioxide and gaseous pollutants and the filtering of particulates, modifying extremes of noise, temperature and humidity, protecting against soil erosion by catching and holding precipitation in both the leaves and root systems, preserving water quality through absorption of nitrogen and filtering of nutrients, sediments and pollutants and cooling of streamwater in summer, providing wildlife habitats and areas for recreation and offering economic and aesthetic benefits.</p>	

issue

BROWNFIELDS

Description

A brownfield is an abandoned, idled, or underutilized property where redevelopment is in part inhibited by actual or perceived environmental contamination. Although brownfields are frequently a blighting influence on communities, in many cases they also represent some of the best opportunities for neighborhood redevelopment. A variety of brownfield sites exist in Marion County ranging from old factory sites to sites with illegal dumping to abandoned gas stations. The Department of Metropolitan Development has created a position of Brownfields Coordinator to assist in their redevelopment but much remains to be done.

goal five

Clean-up and reuse areas with environmental contamination and clarify the status of areas with the perception of environmental contamination.

Recommendations	Responsible parties	Comments
a) Promote the use of brownfields through subsidizing new or updating existing infrastructure.	DMD, DPW, Utilities	
b) Within the Brownfields program, specifically target certain environmentally sensitive areas for clean up.	DMD	Examples include wellfields and areas near rivers and streams
c) Amend state statutes to permit the meaningful tax abatements and tax increment financing on brownfield parcels which contain an assessed valuation, but do not have significant market value.		Although DMD can suggest such legislation, it is in the control of the State legislature to propose, hear and enact legislation.
d) Promote the reuse of brownfields as open space and green space.	DMD, DPR	
e) Use rezoning to more flexible/favorable districts as appropriate as a method to hasten the re-use of brownfields.	DMD	

issue

CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES IN CITY PLANNING

Description

The way that environmental matters are handled through the conventions of land planning and development can either help or hinder actual protection of natural resources. The current Comprehensive Plan calls attention to environmentally sensitive areas in two ways: through the “Urban Conservation” land use category and through “Critical Areas.” Although critical areas have generally been considered successful, the success of the Urban Conservation land use category has been much debated. Much of the debate stems from the confusion caused by one category performing two separate functions: one function is to denote areas that should not be developed, the other is denote areas that, when developed, should be developed in a environmentally sensitive manner.

goal six Use the conventions of land use planning to protect environmentally sensitive areas.		
<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Responsible parties</i>	<i>Comments</i>
a) Change existing policy to exclude regulated areas such as floodways and levees to the extent of the law when calculating housing densities.	DMD	
<i>Standards:</i> <i>When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:</i>	<i>Justification</i>	
xii. use “Floodway” as the land use category for floodways.	To emphasize the ban on building in floodways.	
xiii. replace the “Urban Conservation” land use category with “Environmentally Sensitive” as an index or overlay land use recommendation.	Calls attention to the need for special attention to environmental resources.	
xiv. use the concept of Critical Areas as used in the 1990-1993 plan.	Critical areas should be used sparingly to retain the “specialness” that is their value.	

issue

LIGHT/NOISE/VIEWS

Description

Excessive light and noise can make otherwise compatible land uses into poor neighbors. Although noise and glare provisions are included in the City's zoning ordinances they have not been as effective as they could be.

The lack of mountains, lakes and oceans may lead many to consider Indianapolis lacking in scenic views. However many notable views, such as those to landmarks like the Soldiers and Sailors Monument, add much to the heritage of the City. Loss or degradation of these views would also be a loss of quality of life.

goal seven

To protect residential areas from excessive light or noise.

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Responsible parties</i>	<i>Comments</i>
a) Amend the zoning district ordinances to add specificity with the goal of making the light and noise provisions easier to enforce.	DMD	The City of Nashville, Tennessee's ordinance provides a good example.
b) Form a study group to research the topic of protecting and enhancing scenic views.	DMD	Of particular interest are views of natural features, views of the Downtown skyline and the views encountered by visitors to the City.

PARKS AND GREENWAYS

Description

Provision of adequate parkland to serve the growing population and expanding built area of the city is an ongoing challenge. Since the adoption of the 1990-1993 Comprehensive Plan the Indianapolis greenways system has matured and taken an important place in the recreation assets of city. Like the rest of the park and recreation system, it must continue to grow to meets the ongoing needs of the population.

8. Goal: To provide all Marion County residents, whether in established or developing neighborhoods, a variety of convenient parks and greenways and to protect existing parks and greenways from encroachment.

Recommendations	Responsible parties	Comments
a) Use of parkland for non-park purposes is to be strongly discouraged and any taking for parkland should be at market value, as a direct purchase, lease arrangement or trade for similar land in the vicinity.	DPR, DMD	
b) Develop a reliable funding mechanism for the acquisition of parks and greenways.	DPR, DMD	Possibilities include impact fees, point-of-purchase fees, tax check-offs, partnerships with the Indianapolis Parks Foundation, etc.
Standards: <i>When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:</i>	Justification	
xv. use two land use categories for existing and proposed parks: Park and Linear Park.	These categories provide an appropriate level of specificity and are easy to use and understand.	

<p>xvi. use the updated Indianapolis Greenways Plan as the basis for the Linear Park designations. Additions to the updated plan can be included to provide improve connections among neighborhoods, parks and community amenities through a variety of path, trail and sidewalk options.</p>	<p>The updated Indianapolis Greenways Plan represents an extensive public planning process and adoption by the Board of Parks and Recreation and the Metropolitan Development Commission.</p>
<p>xvii. use the parks-to-population standard set forth in “Pathways to the Future, the Indianapolis-Marion County Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan” or updates of this plan. At this time the standard is 17.3 acres of parkland for every 1000 persons of actual or projected population.</p>	<p>“Pathways to the Future” represents an extensive public planning process and adoption by the Board of Parks and Recreation and the Metropolitan Development Commission. This standard should be applied at a sub-township level.</p>
<p>xviii. provide a park within 1 mile of each residential development.</p>	<p>Each neighborhood should expect to have a park within convenient walking or bicycling distance.</p>

issue

OPEN SPACE/ACCESS TO NATURE

Description

Open space consists of all the unbuilt portions of the city including parks, public spaces and farmland. As the city grows, it continues to push outwards at ever increasing rates. From 1960 to 1990 the population of the metropolitan area increased by 50%, while the built area increased by 300%. Current forms of open space preservation have not preserved as much open space as might be considered appropriate.

goal

Reserve quality open space as habitats for plants and animals and as a quality-of-life amenity for the city.

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Responsible parties</i>	<i>Comments</i>
a) Retain and promote the cluster option available in the Dwelling District Zoning Ordinance as a valuable tool for preservation of open space.	DMD	
b) Amend the cluster option in the Dwelling District Zoning Ordinance to allow transfer of the preserved open space to the Department of Parks and Recreation at the approval of the Department as it meets their mission.	DMD, DPR	
c) Provide incentives beyond the cluster option for the conservation of environmentally sensitive areas such as stream buffers, woodlands, and native meadows.	DMD, DPW, DPR	Possibilities include tax reductions, and stormwater credits.
d) Amend the Dwelling District Zoning ordinance to require community open space within residential developments over a certain size.	DMD	The open space should perform some valuable recreation or environment function and not just be a “leftover”.
e) Encourage development practices that protect existing natural features/assets,	DMD	

promote innovative land use designs and focus on sustainable natural systems.		
f) Establish specific impact statements as a justification for a deviation from a recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan. Said impact statement should be incorporated into the Rules of Procedures of the Metropolitan Development Commission and Boards of Zoning Appeals.	DMD	The impact statement must provide a comparable justification based upon the probable impact of the requested land use as compared to the typical impact of the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan
g) Develop a mechanism for a “heightened review” of development petitions for areas with the Comprehensive Plan designation of Environmentally Sensitive.	DMD	Review should include City staff with environmental expertise as well as concerned citizens and citizen organizations.
h) Provide mitigation options such as tree banking or open space banking	DMD	
i) Review existing City ordinances and polices to determine which, if any, impede the implementation of “New Urbanism” developments and then make appropriate ordinance or policy amendments.	DMD	Open space is a hallmark of “New Urbanism” development; encouragement of this type of development would be likely to increase the amount of preserved open space.

supplemental
INFORMATION

Appendices

appendix one

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

The Comprehensive Plan is a broad philosophical document, which promotes public health, safety, morals, convenience, order and the general welfare; encourages efficiency and economy in the process of development; promotes livability; and preserves the quality of life.

While the Comprehensive Plan is, by state law, the basis for zoning, the Plan may be developed for more than this limited purpose. State law requires that the Plan contain a statement of objectives for the future development of the City, a statement of policy for land use development and a statement of policy for the development of public ways, public places, public lands, public structures and public utilities. State law, however, permits each jurisdiction to develop its comprehensive plan in the way that mostly nearly meets the needs of that jurisdiction.

In Indianapolis-Marion County, the Comprehensive Plan has historically been more than a series of policy statements. It has been a detailed guide for development, which has contained policies, maps, text and critical areas designating the most appropriate land use recommendations for all parcels of land in Indianapolis and explaining the basis for those recommendations. The Plan was initially adopted in 1965 and has been updated in roughly 7 to 10 year increments, with the most recent update occurring between 1991 and 1993.

Extensive public input has already been a part of the comprehensive planning process. Indianapolis Insight began with a kick-off conference, which was followed by a series of town hall meetings. This was followed by the Issue Committee process. Throughout the planning process a Steering Committee will keep things on track. Other forms of public outreach included press releases, a newsletter and a website.

Kick-off Conference

Held September 14th, 2000. Over 1000 persons were invited to attend and bring others. Attendance was estimated at 220 persons for the morning-long event. The event included a presentation by Dr. Catherine Ross of the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority, a panel discussion by local

leaders with various viewpoints on the topic of city development and a presentation of the planning process to be used for the Indianapolis Insight Plan. The conference was covered in the local news media.

Town Hall Meetings

The first series of Town Hall Meetings was held in September and October of 2000. Over 1200 persons were invited, including every registered neighborhood organization. Meetings were held in four locations around the city on various nights of the week over a three-week period. Attendance ranged from 20 to 40 persons per meeting. Participants were asked about what city development issues were important to them now and in the future. Participants were given the opportunity to sign up for the issue committees. Three of the four meetings were covered by the local news media.

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee is made up of 43 persons representing various groups with a stake in the development of the city. Its membership includes the chairpersons of the Issue Committees. The Steering Committee meets as needed throughout the planning process.

Newsletters

A newsletter, *The View*, was sent out in November 2000. Mailed to over 1200 persons, including every registered neighborhood organization, *The View* contained information on the planning process to date and the invitation to take part in the Issue Committees.

Subsequent issues of *The View* will be sent out as needed throughout the planning process.

Press Releases

The local media is notified about the Indianapolis Insight Plan at every step in the process. Press releases and media advisories go to 50 television, radio, and print media sources. The decision to run a notice about upcoming meetings or to cover a particular meeting is up to each media source and not up to the City. However, coverage has been good, with notices and stories run in a variety of television, radio and print sources.

Website

The Indianapolis Insight plan has its own website within the City's website. This website details the planning process and includes notices of upcoming meetings and minutes of past meetings. The website has experienced over 1000 hits from mid-December 2000 through the end of July 2001.

Volunteer Hours

As of July 31, 2001 almost 700 volunteers have contributed over 3500 hours to the planning process.

appendix two

VALUE STATEMENTS

Using the public comment at the Town Hall meetings as well as good planning principles, the Steering Committee developed a series of Value Statements to guide the planning process. Ideally all goals, recommendations, standards and land use recommendations will contribute to these values. At the very least they must not detract from these values. The Value Statements are as follows:

Development of our City should meet the needs of the present without compromising the need of future generations.

We should strive to achieve a balance of land uses, including a diversity of housing options, throughout the various parts of the county and the region. Balanced land use is important not only for tax base equity, but also for communities where people can live, shop, recreate and earn a living throughout the different phases of their lives.

New developments should be well-planned, well-built and well-maintained to retain value over the long term. Established areas should be well-maintained to retain (or regain) value and to preserve applicable unique identities.

Education programs of the highest quality are vital to the health and well being of the City. We should encourage all citizens, regardless of age, to participate in the learning process throughout their lives. We should offer educational programs to individuals with a wide range of talents and abilities, enabling all members of the community to develop to their fullest potential. We must ensure that educational opportunities are available to all citizens, regardless of race, sex, religion, national origin or disability. We must maintain a world class educational system, providing programs of the highest quality to all citizens.

We should strive to maintain a healthy environment and to make appropriate improvements to the current state of the environment. Of particular importance are clean air, ground and surface water, conservation of natural features including wooded areas, and adequate parks and open space.

We should continue to improve our transportation system so that it is well-connected, convenient, and safe. We should provide a variety of

transportation choices so that all people, regardless of age or ability, can travel throughout the region. The transportation and infrastructure systems should anticipate and guide the growth of the City.

We should maintain and further develop a strong, diverse economy and make efforts to attract and retain highly skilled and educated workers. Forces of disinvestment and decline should be countered with a variety of redevelopment and reinvestment activities wherever needed to maintain the vitality of the community.

The Regional Center should continue as the focus of the larger scale cultural events and venues, however we should support a variety of cultural activities within all parts of the city. We should respect historic structures and neighborhoods as the physical embodiment of our historical and cultural identity.

As the center of an increasingly regional metropolitan area, Indianapolis should be a leader in planning-related cooperation and communication.

appendix three

RESOURCES

Greenways Master Plan

Bike/Ped Plan

CSO Master Plan

Barrett Law Master Plan

Stormwater Master Plan

Flood control and floodplain management

Wellfield protection

Nozone program

appendix four

MEETING MINUTES

MEETING ONE

January 22, 2001

Committee Members present:

Merri Anderson
Joe Arnold (for Kevin
Kirk)
Linda Broadfoot
Donald Colvin
David Forsell
Jeff Gearhart
Vince Griffin
Jay Ham

Kyle Hendrix
Ray Irvin (for Lori Gil)
John Kupke
Jayne Langan
Greg Lindsey
Rick Martin
Russell McClure
Sheila McKinley
Sandra Miles
Jeffrey Miller
Don Miller

Carl Pebworth
Donna Price
Robert Snyder
Maria Steiner
Dick Van Frank

Others present:

Sandeep Barre
Greg Gerke
Jonathan Gick
Adam Rickert

Jeanette Robertson
Tammara Tracy
Sarah Anne Warrum

Staff present:

Alice Gatewood
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

Rules of Conduct-Jeffrey Miller

Values Statements-Jeffrey Miller, assisted by committee members

The Comprehensive Plan and the planning process-Keith Holdsworth

Background materials-Keith Holdsworth

Discussions:

Meeting time and location.

Scope of the committee's work. In setting its goals, the committee may want to think about how we determine success. One way to measure success is through a set of indicators. When discussing open space preservation we may want to do so in terms of economic development, aesthetics and family.

The option to break into smaller sub-groups was mentioned but was decided against. However committee members did agreed to communicate "offline" when necessary.

The committee may have joint meetings with other issue committees where their issues overlap.

For example the committee may want to meet with the Transportation and Infrastructure

Committee on the topics of air quality and CSO's.

Requests for information:

How effective is the existing comprehensive plan?

How well did the MDC follow the existing comprehensive plan?

How does Indianapolis compare to other cities in parks and park planning?

How does Indianapolis compare to other cities in greenspace preservation (acres/person)?

Decisions:

Meetings will be held at 4:30 p.m. on Mondays, preferably at the Library Services Center. The topics that the committee has determined are within its scope are as shown on the attached sheet.

Assignments:

Keith Holdsworth will look into setting up an "E-list" to make communication among committee members easier.

Keith Holdsworth will provide copies of the 1993 draft environmental policy papers as provided by Merri Anderson.

MEETING TWO

February 12, 2001

Committee Members present:

Merri Anderson
Lou Ann Baker
Linda Broadfoot
Donald Colvin
David Forsell
Jeff Gearhart
Kyle Hendrix

Kevin Kirk
John Capuche
Jayne Langan
Greg Lindsey
Jeffrey Marble
Marcia Matthieu
Russell McClure
Sandra Miles
Jeffrey Miller

Scott Miller
Carl Pebworth
Donna Price
Robert Snyder
Cindy Spoljaric
Maria Steiner
Roger Stephens
Dick Van Frank
Others present:

Greg Gerke
Clarke Kahlo
Jeanette Robertson
Kevin Strunk

Staff present:

Alice Gatewood
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

Comparison of Zoning Petitions to the Comprehensive Plan Recommendations – Keith Holdsworth. See attached hand-out.

Wellfield Issues – Cindy Spoljaric. Current city ordinances were developed in the mid-1990's in response to state and federal directives. When businesses that use certain amounts of potential contaminants seek an Improvement Location Permit, they become subject to an additional review. This review is conducted by an independent expert in groundwater called the TQP (Technically Qualified Person). These businesses must show how they will guard against the potential contamination of the groundwater. Frequently they are required to seal their floors and provide double-walled containers and other such measures. About 5 to 20 of these reviews are done each year. City ordinance has also set up the Marion County Wellfield Education Corporation (MCWEC) to provide education to the general public and specifically to residents and business owners in the wellfield areas. MCWEC provides technical information to businesses on how to better protect against groundwater contamination. Compliance with MCWEC's suggestions is voluntary and not mandated by law. Cindy provided a list of groundwater-related websites (attached).

Flooding and Water Quality Issues – Kevin Kirk and Donna Price. See attached slides from Kevin and Donna's PowerPoint presentation.

Discussions:

Wellfield Issues. One of the greatest threats to the wellfields and to the ground water in general is failing septic systems. Other major issues for wellfield protection are brownfields and use of the land within the wellfield protection areas. It was suggested that maybe certain businesses be banned from locating in wellfields. Because underground tanks are already banned in the W-1 areas, this effectively bans gas stations. Concern was expressed over businesses that use potential contaminants that are "grandfathered" and thus are not subject to the current ordinance. Concern was also expressed about having an adequate supply of water for the metropolitan area as it continues to grow. Some sources of groundwater are usable because they are already

contaminated. The Indianapolis Water Company continues to explore new water sources. It was suggested that greater conservation of water would help alleviate some of the problems. Flooding/Water Quality Issues. It was asked how the comprehensive plan could affect or be affected by flooding and water quality issues. Although the comprehensive plan will not be about fixing the CSO situation directly, it can make recommendations concerning the relationship between land development and water quality. For instance, the plan may recommend preservation of vegetation along stream corridors; this keeps the water cooler and promotes improved water quality. It was suggested that as the water quality in our streams improves, we should work for greater accessibility to the streams.

Requests for information:

What is the MDC/Current Planning staff's record on parcels recommended as potential parks or urban conservation in the comprehensive plan?

Other:

As requested at the first meeting, copies of the 1993 draft environmental policy papers were made available.

A source for more information of flooding issues is www.floods.org

MEETING THREE

March 5, 2001

Committee Members

present:

Merri Anderson
Lou Ann Baker
Jennifer Bowman
Todd Cook
David Forsell
Jeff Gearhart
Jay Ham

Kyle Hendrix
Michael Krosschell (for
Donald Colvin)
Jayne Langan
Jeffrey Marble
Russell McClure
Sheila McKinley
Sandra Miles
Donald Miller

Jeffrey Miller
Scott Miller
Donna Price
Robert Snyder
Cindy Spoljaric
Dick Van Frank
Others present: Kevin
Fleming
Kevin Strunk

Pam Thevenow
Mary Walker

Staff present:

Kevin Gross
Keith Holdsworth
Kevin Mayfield

Presentations:

A presentation was made by Kevin Strunk on wetlands and various other environmental issues (see attached hand-out). In addition to the comments on his hand-out, Kevin talked about how, in a recent Supreme Court hearing, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has been ruled not to have jurisdiction over wetlands that do not connect to navigable waters. However this ruling may not have much local impact, due to authority of the State to regulate wetlands. Kevin also suggested that Marion County refuse to hear cases involving development in floodplains unless the petitioner has a permit from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management.

A presentation was made by Pam Thevenow on the problems related too septic systems (see attached handout).

Discussions:

The opinion was voiced that many of the water-related issues would be eased by widespread public education on these topics.

Concern was expressed that extending sewers into areas with failing septic systems would exacerbate the CSO problem. Concern was expressed over finding ways other than the Barrett Law to pay for bringing sewers into neighborhoods with septic systems. Greater government financing was suggested, however there was a concern over the public paying for improvements to private property. Allowing for other ways to deal with domestic wastewater such as septic mounds or constructed wetlands was suggested.

The question was asked if a homeowner's Barrett Law costs are offset by an increased selling price. Although this has not been studied, anecdotal evidence suggests that while it may not increase selling prices for the typical home, it frequently reduces time on the market. For homes where the septic system has failed, it does improve the chances of selling. Improvements were made to the Subdivision Control ordinance, so that it now does not allow septic systems in all but two residential zoning districts (DA and DP). Neighborhoods with septic systems are frequently pockets within larger sewerred areas. State law is now being proposed that will encourage, not mandate, management districts for neighborhoods with septic systems. These management districts would provide for joint septic maintenance.

Commercial septic systems are subject to many of the same problems as residential systems, with additional problems caused by the dumping of commercial waste products and contaminants that the systems are not made to accept (paint, oil, cleaning solutions).

Other:

Due to inadequate discussion time, the next meeting will continue the discussion of water-related issues. Park related issues will be bumped to the following meeting. Committee members are encouraged to develop water-related goal statements and e-mail (kholdsw@indygov.org), fax (327-5103) or mail them to Keith Holdsworth by March 19 for distribution prior to the March 26th meeting.

MEETING FOUR

March 26, 2001

Committee Members present:

Merri Anderson
Linda Broadfoot
Donald Colvin
Todd Cook
Diane Foglesong

Jeff Gearhart
Greg Lindsey
Russell McClure
Sandra Miles
Donald Miller
Jeffrey Miller
Donna Price

Cindy Spoljaric
Maria Steiner
Dick Van Frank
Others present:
Jeanette Robertson
David Rogier
Pam Thevenow

Staff present:

Kevin Gross
Keith Holdsworth

Discussions:

Six pages of suggested goals were submitted to the committee by individual committee members prior to the meeting. Staff grouped these suggested goals into broad topical areas and sent the list out to the committee members prior to the meeting for their review.

To facilitate covering so much material in an efficient manner, the committee broke into two groups to go over the suggested goals. One group worked on wellfield, septic and wastewater goals; the other committee worked on flooding and stormwater goals. Each committee was asked to separate out the non-comprehensive plan items, to sort out goals from recommendations and standards, to reach consensus on the goals and to work on the objectives and standards.

Ideas that were not considered appropriate to the comprehensive plan were not lost but will be forwarded to the appropriate agency.

The results of each group's efforts are attached.

Other:

Although a lot of progress was made at this meeting, there is still some work that needs to be done on water-related topics. A sub-committee was formed to continue this work and will report back to the full committee at a later meeting. The sub-committee members are Sandy Miles, Russ McClure, Don Miller, and Pam Thevenow.

MEETING FIVE

April 16, 2001

Committee Members present:

Merri Anderson
Lou Ann Baker
Bill Beranek
Linda Broadfoot
Donald Colvin
Todd Cook

Alicia Craig
David Forsell
Kyle Hendrix
Jayne Langan
Jeffrey Marble
Sheila McKinley
Sandra Miles
Jeffrey Miller

Don Miller
Scott Miller
Donna Price
Robert Snyder
Maria Steiner
Dick Van Frank

Others present:

William Adams
Otis Guffay
Michael Krosschell

Staff present:

Alice Gatewood
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

Don Colvin of Indy Parks made a presentation on parkland issues that are being faced by the City. Copies of his presentation were mailed to the committee members prior to the meeting.

Discussions:

The meeting opened with a report on the April 12th Steering Committee meeting by Jeffrey Miller. He was concerned about the low attendance at that meeting. He offered to write a letter to the Director of the Department of Metropolitan Development expressing his concern. The committee encouraged him to do so. Jeffrey also commented that he thought that one of the biggest differences among the issue committees was on the topic of how firm vs. how flexible the plan should be.

Assignments:

At the next meeting, the committee will discuss standards for making parkland recommendations on the new land use maps. Committee members are encouraged to think about this in advance. Committee members may also submit ideas to Keith Holdsworth by May 2 and he will send them out to the committee for consideration prior to the next meeting.

MEETING SIX

May 14, 2001

Committee Members present:

Jennifer Bowman
Mark Boyce
Linda Broadfoot
Donald Colvin
Todd Cook
Alicia Craig

Jeff Gearhart
Kyle Hendrix
Ray Irvin
Jayne Langan
Greg Lindsey
Jeffrey Marble
Sandra Miles
Jeffrey Miller

Don Miller
Neil Myers
Donna Price
Robert Snyder
Dick Van Frank

Others present:

Tori Colvin

Todd Dorcas
Paul Smith

Staff present:

Alice Gatewood
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

Neil Myers made a presentation on a project his firm has worked on in northern Indiana. This development, Coffee Creek Center, is 640 acres, of which over a quarter has been preserved as riparian corridor, woods, wetlands and prairie. The wetlands and prairie are being used as part of the wastewater and stormwater system. The development is still under construction including a path system through the preserved open space areas.

Kyle Hendrix made an overview presentation on brownfields (Brownfields Redevelopment 101) and provided examples of projects where brownfields were redeveloped into parks and open space.

Discussions:

The meeting attendees broke into three groups, each to discuss its own topic.

Table A discussed park standards for the comprehensive plan. This group recommended that the categories to use on the comp plan maps should be "Park" and "Linear Park". The basis for the Linear Park designations should be the updated Indianapolis Greenways Plan, but additions could be made for better connecting neighborhoods and parks to the greenways system. The standard recommended for the Park category was 17.3 acres per 1000 persons as put forth in "Pathways to the Future" coupled with an attempt to have a park within one mile of each residential development.

Table B discussed open space and tree preservation. The tree preservation discussion centered on the intent of the impending tree preservation ordinance-writing process. The group recommended that wooded areas be inventoried and that higher quality woodlands be targeted for preservation over lesser quality woodlands and that the total environmental qualities of wooded areas be considered rather than just the single aspect of the appearance of wooded areas. There was also a concern about saving notable specimen trees. A need to better coordinate the City's processes of drainage review and tree preservation was noted. Education of developers and the general public in the value of tree preservation was another major topic of discussion. Discussion on the

preservation of wetlands and of finding methods to pay for the preservation of open space also occurred.

Table C discussed brownfields. This group suggested that it would be helpful in the redevelopment of brownfields to make current programs such as tax abatement more enticing. Also the City can promote the reuse of brownfields through subsidizing new or updating existing infrastructure to these sites and by getting involved in the transfer of land which can remove some of the liability attached to a brownfield. It was recommended that certain priorities could be targeted in the City's brownfield program such as brownfields in wellfields, near rivers and streams and where the brownfield could become a park or other greenspace. The group urged the City not to be timid when pursuing abandoned or unsafe buildings that might also be brownfields or when considering brownfields for siting capital projects.

MEETING SEVEN

June 4, 2001

Committee Members present:

Merri Anderson
Linda Broadfoot
Donald Colvin
Todd Cook

Kyle Hendrix
Jayne Langan
Greg Lindsey
Rick Martin
Sheila McKinley
Sandra Miles

Jeffrey Miller
Don Miller
Neil Myers
Dick Van Frank

Staff present:

Alice Gatewood
Kevin Gross
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

Linda Broadfoot made a presentation on the work of Keep Indianapolis Beautiful. KIB is an affiliate of Keep America Beautiful. KIB is largely a “match-making” organization that puts volunteers and donors together with neighborhoods and other groups needing assistance on clean city and open space issues. Some of KIB’s projects are the city’s recycling program, clean ups tree planting, park building, community gardens and they are starting a for-profit landscape maintenance business. Linda sees community building as the product of KIB’s work.

Rick Martin of the Indianapolis Department of Public Works made a presentation on the ozone and other air quality issues facing the Indianapolis region. Indianapolis meets the federal one-hour standard for ozone, but does not meet the newer 8-hour standard. Much of this is due to the region’s geography, even monitoring stations in remote parts of rural Indiana exceed the 8-hour standard. Ozone is not emitted but is formed in the atmosphere from precursors such as volatile organic compounds and nitrous oxides. Point source emissions of these precursors have dropped in the last two decades. The biggest source of precursors is individuals through their vehicles and other engine-powered devices such as lawn mowers. Improvements in cleaner auto emissions have been offset by increased number of vehicle miles traveled. Development patterns that encourage walking and bicycling over vehicle use would be one solution for the region’s air quality problems. Another would be a widespread and widely used mass transit system.

Discussions:

The committee accepted the water sub-committee’s proposed goals, recommendations and standards. Anyone who has further comments, questions or concerns about these items should contact Keith prior to the next meeting.

The committee discussed the preliminary recommendations and standards developed out of the discussions at the May 14th meeting. On park-related issues the committee asked for changes concerning “setting a higher bar” when discussing conversion of parkland to non-park uses, adding sidewalks into the greenways recommendation, and how best to reference standards in the Parks, Recreation And Open Space Plan. A change was also asked for in the park goal statement to clarify the goal of providing adequate parkland throughout the county. On tree-related issues the committee asked for changes concerning street trees, better timing of tree preservation concerns

within the zoning process and the need to broaden the scope of the resolution concerning the tree conservation ordinance. On brownfield-related issues the committee asked for changes concerning the use of brownfields as open space.

The meeting attendees broke into three groups, each to discuss its own topic.

Table A discussed topics from the previous meeting that needed further work. On the topic of parks the group discussed the need to set up a reliable funding mechanism for park and open space acquisition and for urban forestry. Impact fees, point of purchase fees for new homes and tax return check-offs were mentioned as possibilities. The group recommended adding provisions for tree planting into the single-family zoning ordinance or to the subdivision control ordinance. The group recommended strengthening the requirements for landscaping within parking lots, possibly based on canopy coverage. The group affirmed the use of the cluster option for the preservation of open space with a proposed change to allow for transfer of the preserved open space to the Department of Parks and Recreation at the Department's discretion and within its mission. On the topic of brownfields the group discussed how the City might be able to hasten the reuse of brownfields through rezoning to more favorable districts.

Table B discussed protection of environmentally sensitive areas and how to show them on the comprehensive plan maps. The group discussed making zoning code changes to further restrict development in wetlands and floodplains. Changes in zoning procedures were suggested to bring an environmental perspective to the debate at an earlier point in the process. One way that was strongly recommended to do this would be an environmental commission that would review cases for their environmental impact. The group agreed with the points in the hand-out "Thoughts on Environmentally Sensitive areas" to break the Urban Conservation land use category into two categories "Floodway" and "Environmentally Sensitive Development", to make this second category an overlay category, and to keep the critical area concept.

Table C discussed light and noise pollution, clean city issues and air quality. The group discussed the need to make current light and noise ordinances more enforceable. They also discussed the use of trees to buffer light and noise. A concern was expressed about not reducing light levels to a point where there would be safety and security concerns. Although the group thought that clean city issues (litter/trash/graffiti) were important they did not think that the Comprehensive Plan was the place to address them. For improving air quality, the group discussed mass transit and a sidewalk and bikeway system integrated with vehicular traffic flow. The group discussed more sustainable communities where people could walk or bike to grocers, drugstores and similar facilities, thus reducing the number of vehicle miles driven. The group discussed the use of alternative fuels for fleets and for developing an infrastructure for alternative fuels into the wider community.

MEETING EIGHT

June 25, 2001

Committee Members present:

Merri Anderson
Linda Broadfoot
Jeff Gearhart
Jayne Langan

Greg Lindsey
Russell McClure
Sandra Miles
Jeffrey Miller
Don Miller
Donna Price

Robert Snyder
Dick Van Frank

Others Present:

Sally Bias
Cindy Porteous

Staff present:

Kevin Gross
Keith Holdsworth

Discussions:

The committee as a whole reviewed the work of the last meeting's three breakout groups. Suggestions for changes to the goals, recommendations and standards were the need to better describe or define what is meant by "high-quality woodlands", and to better state the goal relating to brownfields so as not to imply a need to clean up areas that may not be contaminated.

The committee then began to work through the items listed on the "Remaining Discussion Items" hand-out. Discussion of "Access to nature" focused on both preserving natural areas as called out in the Park Comprehensive Plan and providing the means to get to natural areas by foot or bicycle. Discussion of "Clean air" revolved around proving sidewalks in newly developing areas and retrofitting them into already developed areas, cross-referencing the clean air recommendations of the Transportation and Infrastructure Issue Committee and the ideas presented in the hand-out "The Land Use-Air Quality Linkage". Keith will summarize the main points of this hand-out in the form of recommendations and standards for the next meeting. A better wording of the recommendation concerning density calculations was developed. Discussion of tree preservation again pointed out the need to better describe high quality woodland. Stands of native trees and wooded wetlands were mentioned as areas in particular need of preservation. The issue of tree clearance was also mentioned. A sub-committee will meet prior to the next full committee meeting to further discuss this topic. Volunteers included Merri Anderson, Greg Lindsey, Dick Van Frank, Don Miller, Jeffrey Miller and Bob Snyder.

The group then moved on to the seven recommendations previously made on the topic of Open Space. Two of the recommendations were deleted and two were tabled to the next meeting. The committee decided that there was a need to develop recommendations concerning preservation of scenic views. Incentives for conservation of natural resources and a mandatory open space requirement in developments over a certain size were recommended.

A ninth and final meeting will be held on July 23rd at 4:30; location to be determined.

MEETING NINE

July 23, 2001

Committee Members present:

Merri Anderson
Mark Boyce
Linda Broadfoot
Alicia Craig

Jayne Langan
Jeffrey Marble
Sheila McKinley
Sandra Miles
Jeffrey Miller
Don Miller

Neil Myers
Donna Price
Dick Van Frank
Terri Van Zant (for Ray
Irvin)

Others Present:

Bobbie Bosch

Staff present:

Kevin Gross
Keith Holdsworth

Discussions:

Minutes of the June 25 meeting were accepted.

The first topic of discussion was the proposals of the Tree and Woodland Sub-Committee. The work of this committee was accepted with two changes: clarifying the site clearing language in the recommendation about a tree conservation ordinance and adding further language on the benefits of trees in the justification of the environmentally sensitive standard. Three further additions were requested on the topic of trees and woodlands: adding a comment on providing lists of “good” and “bad” trees to developers and the public, adding a comment on the maintenance of street trees in new subdivisions, and referencing the recommendation on the cluster option within the tree and woodland segment of the report.

The next topic of discussion was the proposed recommendations and standards for the Clean Air segment of the report. In addition to some changes in the existing text, it was suggested that we add a recommendation on the construction of sidewalks and/or bikelanes on existing thoroughfares where they do not currently exist when those thoroughfares undergo major reconstruction. It was also suggested that we add a recommendation reinforcing the connection between land use and transportation and that we increase the recommended residential densities needed for mass transit.

The third topic of discussion was the use of innovative land use designs for the protection of natural areas. The committee was interested in providing the public and decision-makers with greater information on the environmental impacts of zoning and use variance petitions. Staff was asked to provide the committee members with at least two recommendations to consider regarding this concern. It was also decided to make recommendations concerning mitigation, particularly tree and green space banking, and surveying current ordinances for impediments to New Urbanism developments. It was decided to make a recommendation encouraging, but not requiring, the use of clustering in residential developments. Staff was also asked to add comments to the recommendation on requiring open space within residential developments over a certain size. The concern is that the required open space should perform some useful recreational or environmental function and not just be a “leftover”.

The meeting concluded with an overview of the remaining steps in the Indianapolis Insight process and with thanks to the committee from staff and the chairperson.

appendix five

GLOSSARY OF PLANNING RELATED TERMS AND ACRONYMS

Many sources of information have been used to prepare this glossary. Included are the *Indianapolis Star* newspaper, the *Indianapolis Business Journal*, the *Unigov Handbook*, prepared by the League of Women Voters; *The Encyclopedia of Indianapolis*, prepared by The Polis Center at IUPUI; the *Dictionary of Banking Terms*, prepared by Barron's Business Guides, the *Rainbow Book*, prepared by the Information and Referral Network, Inc.; *Principles and Practices of Urban Planning*, prepared by the Institute for Training in Municipal Administration; and many documents prepared by the staff of the Department of Metropolitan Development and other agencies listed below. Also the helpful staff members of the Department of Metropolitan Development have contributed a great deal to the information provided here.

Best Management Practices (BMP): Those conservation measures and/or land management techniques deemed most effective in preventing pollution by runoff or seepage from a given field or land area into watercourses.

Brownfield: Abandoned, idled, or under utilized industrial and commercial facilities where expansion or redevelopment is complicated by real or perceived environmental contamination.

Building Codes: Local government regulations that prescribe minimum standards for the construction and maintenance of buildings.

Building Permit: A permit issued by the Division of Permits of the Department of Metropolitan Development. Various types of building permits authorize structural, electrical, heating and cooling, plumbing, or wrecking work. For more information contact the Division of Permits at 327-8700.

Central Indiana Regional Citizens League (CIRCL): A general citizen-based organization that provides the means for citizens to have input into the decisions affecting quality of life issues in central Indiana. Even though the group has only been in operation for a year, CIRCL already has a membership of 330 groups and individuals. For more information call 921-1282.

Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO): An overflow of the combined sanitary and storm sewers, usually during periods of heavy rain.

Community Development Corporation (CDC): A nonprofit organization usually established by concerned citizens who reside in a decaying or blighted neighborhood. The purpose of the organization is to engage in development activities; such as home owner repair, home rehabilitation, new home construction, and commercial revitalization projects. For more information regarding Indianapolis CDCs contact INHP at 925-1400.

Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation Liability Information System (CERCLIS): A list which includes properties across the nation that may contain environmental contamination. For more information contact the Indiana Department of Environmental Management at 308-3045.

Cluster: A group of buildings and especially houses built close together on a sizable tract in order to preserve open spaces larger than the individual plot of land for common recreation.

Comprehensive Plan Segment (CPS): A segment of the Comprehensive Plan for Marion County. Comprehensive plan segments become a part of City policy when adopted by the Metropolitan Development Commission. Adopted Comprehensive plan segments have CPS numbers assigned to them. Examples of comprehensive plan segments are neighborhood plans, township plans, corridor plans, park master plans, and the Official Thoroughfare Plan.

Critical Area: An area which exhibits and unusual character, important location, or significant infrastructures need that warrants a high degree of scrutiny. Critical area recommendations address significant land use issues that require more detailed information than can be shown on the Comprehensive Plan Map.

Department of Metropolitan Development (DMD): A City department that plans and implements projects and services focused on public safety, jobs and economic development, affordable housing, and the empowerment of neighborhoods through citizen participation

Development Plan: A planned development unit characterized by creative planning, variety in physical development, imaginative uses of open spaces. Predominantly residential in nature, but may include supportive commercial, or industrial development.

Division of Community Development and Financial Services (CDFS): A division of the Department of Metropolitan Development with responsibility for seeking federal grants and other funds and monitoring their use in community development efforts. Also CDFS is responsible for the City's participation in certain human service programs and for supporting the Department's budgetary and financial needs. For more information call 327-5151.

Division of Neighborhood Services: A division of the Department of Metropolitan Development that includes Township Administrators. For the Township Administrators call 327-5039.

Division of Permits: A division of the Department of Metropolitan Development that is responsible for assuring that construction activity in the city complies with state and municipal building standards. For more information contact the Division of Permits at 327-8700.

Division of Planning (DOP): A division of the Department of Metropolitan Development that analyzes community conditions, makes projections, recommends plans for private and public projects. The division also includes the Current Planning section. For more information call 327-5151. For more information regarding Current Planning call 327-5155.

Excluded Cities and Towns: The three cities of Beech Grove, Lawrence, and Southport and the town of Speedway that were not annexed into the Consolidated City of Indianapolis.

Floodway/plain: Level land that may be submerged by floodwaters. A plain built up by stream deposition

Geographic Information System (GIS): A means of producing, analyzing, and storing computerized maps. See **Indianapolis Mapping and Geographic Infrastructure System** below.

Goal: The end toward which planning and development efforts are directed. Goals are broad based in nature, but they are more refined than values.

Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee (GIPC): Non-partisan organization of business, civic, religious, and educational leaders which advises the mayor on community concerns. For more information call 327-3860.

High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV): An automobile containing two or more passengers or any form of public or mass transit.

Home Owners' Association (HOA): Organization of residents within a community that collect fees, care for common areas, enforce covenants, and disseminate neighborhood information.

Household: A household includes all the persons who occupy a housing unit. The occupants may be a single family, one person living alone, two or more families living together, or any other group of related or unrelated persons who share living arrangements.

Housing Units: A housing unit is a house, an apartment, a mobile home or trailer, a group of rooms or a single room occupied as separate living quarters or, if vacant, intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live and eat separately from any other persons in the building and which have direct access from outside the building or through a common hall.

Improvement Location Permit (ILP): A "zoning clearance" permit issued by the Division of Permits of the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development. Generally an ILP is required when a new structure is built, the bulk of an existing structure is increased, or a change in the use of property causes an increase in parking requirements. For more information contact the Division of Permits at 327-8700.

Indianapolis Mapping and Geographic Infrastructure System (IMAGIS): The computerized map of Marion County that, when complete, will include information on soils, topography, zoning, utilities, and tax assessment for all parcels.

Indianapolis Urbanized Area (IUA): Census tracts in central Indiana that were identified as a part of the 1990 as making up urbanized area of Indianapolis. This area is smaller than the MPA.

IndyGo: Provides mass transit service to the Marion County area over fixed routes and uses scheduled times of arrival and departure. For more information call 635-2100.

Infrastructure: The underlying foundation or basic framework of a city, including streets, parks, bridges, sewers, street lights, and other utilities.

Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA): A federal program that governs all transportation planning and programming and rules that it “must be conducted cooperatively and in such a way as to provide for continuous and substantive public participation.”

Keep Indianapolis Beautiful (KIB): A private not-for-profit organization dedicated to enhancing the quality of life in our community through environmental education, beautification, recycling and litter reduction and is an award winning affiliate of Keep America Beautiful, Inc. For more information call 264-7555.

Land Bank: A pool of acquired and assembled land in urban areas packaged into sites suitable for redevelopment.

Landmark: An individual, physical element that serves as a reference point in locating a node or district. The Soldiers and Sailors Monument is a good example of a landmark.

Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood Associations (MCANA): A voluntary organization of neighborhood associations in Marion County created to deal with common issues

Marion County Health and Hospital Corporation: Charged with protecting the public health and providing hospital services, the Health and Hospital Corporation operates county wide.

The Division of Public Health records statistical data, and issues birth and death certificates. The Bureau of Community Health Nursing administers nursing services in schools, homes and neighborhood clinics. The Bureau of Environmental Health inspects housing for code compliance, inspects and licenses food establishments, evaluates occupational health hazards and monitors sanitation facilities. It also deals with communicable disease and has an immunization program. There are six Neighborhood Nursing Offices in addition to the Well Baby and Maternity Clinics, Geriatric and Chronic Disease Clinics and the Bell Flower Clinic for sexually transmitted diseases.

Although the Hospital Division is responsible for Wishard Memorial Hospital, the Indiana University School of

Medicine is contracted to manage the hospital. Housed within the hospital is the Midtown Community Mental Health Center, which also has clinics placed throughout the city.

Marion County Wellfield Education Corporation: An organization whose purpose is to prevent contamination to the valuable groundwater resources of Marion County through public awareness and education.

Mayor's Action Center (MAC): An agency that assists citizens of Indianapolis and Marion County in contacting and soliciting services from the city. The MAC takes complaints and requests for service, gives information, and provides regulations regarding abandoned buildings and vehicles, air pollution, dead animal pick-up, fallen trees and limbs, sewer and drainage problems, street and sidewalk maintenance, trash burning and dumping violations, and weed control. For more information 327-4622.

Memorandum of Understanding: A written agreement that clarifies the enforcement roles and responsibilities of each agency in areas of shared authority.

Metropolitan Area: The concept of a metropolitan area (MA) is one of a large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. Some MA's are defined around two or more nuclei. The MA classification is a statistical standard, developed for use by Federal agencies in the production, analysis, and publication of data on MA's. The MA's are designated and defined by the Federal Office of Management and Budget, following a set of official published standards.

Metropolitan Development Commission (MDC): The policy-making body of the Department of Metropolitan Development. It has nine appointed members who serve a one-year term. For more information call 327-3698.

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA): The portion of central Indiana that is expected to be urbanized in the next twenty years. It is the area studied by the MPO and includes all of Marion County and portions of the surrounding counties including the cities of Beech Grove, Indianapolis, Lawrence, Southport, and the town of Speedway. The boundary also includes portions of Hamilton, Boone, Hendricks, Johnson, and Hancock counties, including the municipalities of Fishers, Westfield, Whiteland, New Whiteland, and the cities of Carmel, Zionsville, Brownsburg, Plainfield, and Greenwood. This area is larger than the IUA.

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO): The Metropolitan Development Commission is the designated MPO for the Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Area. The MPO has the responsibility, together with the state and IPTC, for the continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning process required of urbanized areas to qualify for federal transportation funds

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA): A definition of central Indiana used to report Census information. Counties included in the MSA are Boone, Hamilton, Hancock, Hendricks, Johnson, Madison, Marion, Morgan, and Shelby. The MSA was formerly called the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area or SMSA. Madison County has been added to the MSA since the 1990 Census was prepared. The MSA had a 1980 population of 1,166,575 and a 1990 population of 1,249,822.

Not in My Back Yard (NIMBY): Land uses that most people don't want near their homes, such as power plants and junk yards.

Objective: A quantifiable refinement of a goal or means of achieving a goal. Objectives often relate to more than one goal.

Ozone Awareness Program: A public information program of the MPO staff with the purpose of helping to educate the public about the ozone program and enlisting their aid in dealing with the issue. The campaign includes a wide range of educational components such as brochures, radio and television spots, a toll-free information line (1-888-DJA-KNOW), various public relations activities, a KNOZONE web page (www.knozone.com), and reduced transit fares on weekday NOZONE Action Days. The goal is to have cleaner air in Indianapolis and avoid the further federal regulations that may be imposed if air quality is not improved.

Paratransit: Alternatively known as special transportation when applied to social services systems. Applies to a variety of smaller, often flexibility-scheduled and routed nonprofit-oriented transportation services using low-capacity vehicles, such as vans, to operate within a normal urban transit corridors or rural areas. Common patrons are the elderly and persons with disabilities.

Planned Unit Development (PUD): A development which, for zoning approval purposes, is not judged by typical zoning standards but on the basis of an overall plan for the total development. To be approved by the zoning review agency, the plan must include detailed information regarding such issues as land use,

building height, density, and setbacks at the overall edge of the development.

Program: A proposal with an end product that is not physical in nature but is a plan for dealing with an issue. Programs are direct outgrowths of objectives.

Project: A proposal with an end product that is physical in nature. As with programs, projects are direct outgrowths of objectives.

Quality of Life: The attributes or amenities that combine to make an area a good place to live. Examples include the availability of political, educational, and social support systems; good relations among constituent groups; a healthy physical environment; and economic opportunities for both individuals and businesses.

Redevelopment Area: Areas that are designated for redevelopment by the MDC and administered by DMD. Establishing a redevelopment area allows government to accomplish a wide variety of public goals. A variety of tools can be used in the districts to acquire and assemble land (including eminent domain), prepare it for disposition, write-down acquisition costs, make needed area improvements, and assist developers and property owners in improving their property.

Regional Center (RC): A 5.8 square mile area bounded by I-65 and a line extending west from I-65 on the north, I-65 and I-70 on the east, I-70 on the south, and the previously proposed alignment of Harding Street improvements on the west. Plans were prepared for this area in 1970, 1980, and 1990.

Rehab Resource: An agency dedicated to providing building materials for the repair and rehabilitation of existing housing and the construction of new, affordable housing for low- to moderate-income residents. Donations of high-quality building materials are sought from private businesses, including manufacturers, suppliers and contractors. The materials are then redistributed to CDCs and other non-profit organizations who work on behalf of low- to moderate-income families. Individuals may get building materials from Rehab Resources with a referral from any member agency. There is a nominal handling fee to cover the cost of the warehouse operations. For more information contact Rehab Resource at 637-3701.

Supplemental Review: A process in zoning when a proposed development may be reviewed by various city agencies and neighborhood organizations to receive recommendations for consideration as a part of the rezoning process.

Tax Abatement: A reduction in taxes granted to a property owner in a locally designated Economic Revitalization Area who makes improvements to real property or installs new manufacturing equipment. Used manufacturing equipment can also qualify as long as such equipment is new to the State of Indiana. Equipment not used in direct production, such as office equipment, does not qualify for abatement. Land does not qualify for abatement.

Tax Increment Financing (TIF): A method of raising additional capital within declared districts to pay for needed improvements within those districts. The districts are established by the Metropolitan Development Commission. The base of existing assessed valuation is frozen with the incremental revenues obtained by the taxes on new development in the TIF District then becoming available to fund improvement projects.

Technically Qualified Person (TQP): An individual selected by the Metropolitan Development Commission to review site and development plans for sites located within a wellfield and to conduct inspections and monitor compliance of agreed upon conditions for the Improvement Location Permit process.

Township Administrators: The Department of Metropolitan Development has assigned a Township Administrator to each of the nine townships within Marion County. The Township Administrators provide assistance in establishing new neighborhood organizations, bring community groups together which may benefit from combining forces in addressing

common issues, attend community meetings to hear citizen and business concerns first hand and address them with the appropriate government officials, and educate the public on zoning ordinance interpretation and land use issues and how they can participate in the zoning process. Also Township Administrators assist merchants in business expansion or relocation focusing on the economic needs of the community; assist in locating vacant properties and buildings; provide businesses with applicable zoning ordinances, re-zoning, and variance information; provide information about permitting issues; and assist in the formation of new merchants organizations.

For more information call 327-5039.

Underground Storage Tank (UST): A storage tank that is buried under the ground similar to ones used at gasoline service stations. Many have been used to store materials that are considered hazardous. New standards require the removal of older tanks that may leak and pollute the surrounding area.

Urban Conservation: A land use plan category given to land possessing special environmental or valuable natural characteristics, such as wetlands, woodlands, and aquifers.

Value: An ideal, custom, institution, etc. that the people of a society try to achieve.

Vision Statement: A vivid, imaginative conception of the future.

Wellfield: A tract of land that contains one or more wells used for the production of drinking water for the public water supply. For information regarding the protection of Indianapolis wellfields contact 327-5151.

